

To: Vaughn, Stephanie[Vaughn.Stephanie@epa.gov]
Cc: Robert Law[rlaw@demaximis.com]
From: Willard Potter
Sent: Mon 4/15/2013 4:32:33 PM
Subject: Fwd: Requested Information

FYI

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Stan Kaczmarek" <StanK@demaximis.com>
Date: April 15, 2013, 11:53:23 AM EDT
To: "Willard Potter" <otto@demaximis.com>, "Robert Law" <rlaw@demaximis.com>
Cc: "Roger.McCready@CH2M.com" <Roger.McCready@CH2M.com>
Subject: Fwd: RE: Requested Information

This is a key communication received on April 5 from NJDEP confirming what CPG needed to provide in order to get conditional approval of the WDP application. It was sent by Jay to me, and copied on it were Cinque, MacGregor and Cozzi. Risilia was not on the distribution.

Stan

>>> On 4/5/2013 at 12:48 PM, in message
<A3850AF2460D8146978AC0504228BBDC98296E8073@TRETMTSTEV7.tmis.treas.state.nj.us>,
"Nickerson, Jay" <Jay.Nickerson@dep.state.nj.us> wrote:

Stan, NJDEP response requesting confirmation of issues to complete WDP. Thank You for working through on these issues:

- Letters from the treatment and disposal facilities indicating that they are willing to accept and process or dispose sediments from the RM 10.9 Removal Area, and identifying the location where such sediment management will or may occur – NJDEP Response: Letters for Sediment and Supernatant Water material
- Signed and sealed drawings of Removal Action design elements tagged "In support of the NJ Waterfront Development Permit application process"- NJDEP Response: submittal of a 90% complete document with signed/sealed engineering approval of drawings

- Statement or calculation with supporting data indicating that the cap's sand cover on top of its armoring layer has a roughness coefficient similar to or less than that of the existing sediment, further justifying the logical conclusion that the Removal Action will not increase flooding potential on the Passaic River – NJDEP Response – Correct and also need to discuss with Peter DeMeo regarding flood potential hazard.
- Supplement to the application's Compliance Statement covering Sub-chapter 10 of the Flood Hazard rules, providing general statements of compliance (e.g. "Release of contaminants via the Removal Action will be investigated by EPA-approved and EPA monitored procedures") or if CPG believes a section does not apply, a statement as to why it does not- NJDEP Response: Correct

Jay Nickerson

Bureau of Case Management

Site Remediation Program

NJDEP

609-633-1448

Jay.nickerson@dep.state.nj.us

From: Stan Kaczmarek [<mailto:StanK@demaximis.com>]

Sent: Friday, April 05, 2013 11:44 AM

To: Nickerson, Jay

Subject: Requested Information

Jay,

Please confirm for me that the following is what is needed to complete the Waterfront Development Permit application such that a conditional approval can be granted.

- Letters from the treatment and disposal facilities indicating that they are willing to accept and process or dispose sediments from the RM 10.9 Removal Area, and identifying the location where such sediment management will or may occur
- Signed and sealed drawings of Removal Action design elements tagged "In support of the NJ Waterfront Development Permit application process"
- Statement or calculation with supporting data indicating that the cap's sand cover on top of its armoring layer has a roughness coefficient similar to or less than that of the existing sediment, further justifying the logical conclusion that the Removal Action will not increase flooding potential on the Passaic River
- Supplement to the application's Compliance Statement covering Sub-chapter 10 of the Flood Hazard rules, providing general statements of compliance (e.g. "Release of contaminants via the Removal Action will be investigated by EPA-approved and EPA monitored procedures") or if CPG believes a section does not apply, a statement as to why it does not

Stan